UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,790	06/27/2003	Alan Michael Jaffee	7302	6842

7590 12/11/2008

JOHNS MANVILLE
Legal Department
10100 West Ute Avenue
Littleton, CO 80127

EXAMINER	
STEELE, JENNIFER A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1794	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/608,790	JAFFEE, ALAN MICHAEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JENNIFER STEELE	1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 August 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5,7,9,11-23, 25-29 and 31-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5,7,9,11-29 and 31-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

1. **Claim 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 11-15, 17-18, 25, 28, 29, 31-34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehnert (US 4,647,496) in view of Graves (US 5,389,716) in further view of Gill (US 4,637,951).** The previous Office Action rejection of 11/27/2007 is maintained and presented below.

Lehnert teaches a fibrous mat-faced gypsum board comprised of a gypsum core that is sandwiched between two sheets of glass mat (ABST). Lehnert teaches a gypsum core that has one or more additives, which improves the water resistance of the gypsum core. Lehnert teaches glass fibrous mats of good porosity made from chopped fiber in a resinous binder (col. 9, lines 5-38). Lehnert teaches fibrous mats that are capable of forming a strong bond with the set gypsum. Lehnert teaches fibrous mats of materials such as mineral-type glass fibers and synthetic resin fibers that can be of

continuous or discrete strands or fibers and can be woven or nonwoven form. Nonwoven mats such as chopped strand mat can be used. The preferred mat is a fiber glass mat comprising fiber glass filaments oriented in random pattern and bound together with a resin binder such as those known commercially as Dura-Glass by Manville (col. 9, lines 17-38). Lehnert teaches a resinous binder of "modified urea – formaldehyde" (col. 14, lines 35-37). Lehnert differs from the current application and does not teach the fiber sizes of the glass fibrous mats. Lehnert differs from the current application and does not teach a blend of fibers sizes.

Graves teaches a fire resistant bonder for fibrous mats where the mats are comprised of glass fibers or mineral fibers (col. 2, lines 34-36). Graves teaches fibrous mats may be applied as backing layer to plywood, gypsum and other similar structural materials (col. 3, lines 32-35). Graves teaches fibers that can be formed into mats including glass fibers, mineral fibers, graphite fibers, metal fibers and organic fibers (col. 9, lines 24-35). Graves teaches glass fibers improve the structural foundation of the finished mat by increasing its tear resistance and tensile strength and improve the folding and working quality of the mat (col. 10, lines 4-50). Graves teaches fibers of varying sizes may be blended together to form the mat and by varying the length and diameter of the fibers the structural properties of the finished product can be altered. Graves teaches fiber sizes and teaches the fiber sizes and blends referring to Gill (col. 11, lines 11-33). A blend of base fibers and microfibers results in a mat that is more porous than mats produced by previously known methods and is better suited for use as a substrate for subsequently applied coatings such as a vinyl flooring. Graves refers to

Patent No. 4,129,674 to Hannes that utilizes two different sizes of glass fibers. This mat is formed of monofilament glass fibers with elongated glass fiber bundles wherein the bundles reinforce the mat and improve tear resistance.

Gill teaches a fibrous mat that is a blend of glass fibers with a majority of base fibers and a minority of micro fibers that are bonded together with a resinous binder (ABST). The majority of base fibers are chopped glass fibers and have an average micron size of 10 microns which is in the claimed range of 11 +/- 1.5 micron (ABST, col. 3, lines 12-21). Gill teaches a second type of fiber referred to as glass micro fiber that have an average diameter of one micron which is in the range of the claimed range of less than 5.5 micron. Gill teaches glass micro fibers that are staple fibers (col. 3, lines 45-46). The glass micro fibers comprise between 5% and 20% of the total weight of the blend (col. 2, lines 14-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the fiber sizes and fiber size blend compositions of Graves and Gill in the gypsum board facers of Lehnert, motivated to produce a gypsum board with porous fibrous facers.

As to claim 2 and 3, Lehnert does not teach chopped glass fibers selected from the group consisting of E glass, C glass, T glass, sodium borosilicate glass and mixtures thereof. Lehnert does not teach fine staple fibers are composed of C glass. Graves teaches the glass fibers are obtained from conventional "E" glass and derivatives thereof including "A" glass, "C" glass, "S" glass and "T" glass (col. 10, lines 4-11). Graves teaches the fibers are chopped glass fibers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the glass

fiber types of Graves in the fibrous mats facers of Lehnert motivated to produce a gypsum board with a strong structural foundation and with good tear resistance.

As to claim 5 and 7, Lehnert differs from the current application and does not teach the length of the glass fibers in the fibrous mats. Graves teaches chopped glass fibers that are about 1 mm to about 75 mm in length (col. 10, lines 16-19) and a preferred embodiment that the fibers are substantially uniform in length within the range of about 12 mm to 4 mm and preferably 19 mm in length. Gill teaches the chopped glass fibers have an average fiber length ranging from about ¼ to 1 inch, which is 6.4 to 25.4 mm and is in the range of 5 to 30 mm and 6 to 12 mm of the claimed invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the fiber length motivated by Graves and Gill fibrous glass mats for use as facers for gypsum structural board.

As to claim 9, Lehnert teaches chopped glass fibers (col. 9, lines 23-25). Lehnert differs and does not teach fine staple fibers. Graves and Gill teach fine staple fibers that are glass fibers.

As to claim 11, Lehnert differs and does not teach fine staple fibers are composed of C-glass. Graves teaches blends of fibers and staple fibers, as referenced to Gill. Grave teaches "C" glass fibers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ a fine staple fiber produced of "C" glass motivated by Graves fibrous mat facers for use in structural gypsum board.

As to claims 12-14, Lehnert differs from the current application and does not teach fine staple fibers with the fiber diameter and length recited in claims 12-15. Gill

teaches the average micro fiber diameter is less than 1 micron and the average length range between 1/8 and ¼ inch which is 3.2 to 6.4 mm and in the range of the claimed fine staple fibers (col. 3, lines 57-58).

As to claim 15, Lehnert differs from the current application and does not teach a blend of fiber sizes. Graves references Gill for teaching blends of fiber sizes and Gill teaches composition of the minor portion, (fine staple fibers), of 2-37%. Gill teaches the greater percentage of microfiber (fine staple fiber), the greater the density and the lower the porosity. It would have been obvious to employ the composition of fibers sizes motivated to optimize the porosity of the glass fibrous mat.

As to claim 17, Lehnert teaches a structure with a first and second facer comprising a fibrous mat.

As to claims 18, Lehnert teaches a resinous binder of "modified urea – formaldehyde" (col. 14, lines 35-37).

As to claims 25 and 28, Lehnert teaches gypsum sheathing and gypsum core of wallboard and building materials where the gypsum has many desirable characteristics such as fire-resistant properties and water resistance.

As to claim 32 and 34, Lehnert teaches a porous fibrous glass mat as a first and second facer. Lehnert differs from the current application and does not teach the air permeability of the mat. Graves references Gill and teaches that, the properties of the fibrous mat can be optimized through varying fiber blends in the mat, (col. 11, lines 10-26 of Graves). Gill discloses air permeability in the range of 180-220 cfm, however Gill does not disclose the permeability per square foot of mat and does not disclose the

permeability per test method ASTM D737 at 0.5 inches of water. Gill teaches that porosity can be optimized by the composition of microfibers and chopped fibers (col. 6, lines 10-22). Gill teaches that the porosity is measured by the Frazier Air Permeability test (col. 5, lines 10-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the blends of fibers of Gill motivated by Graves and Gill teachings to improve or obtain the desired porosity of the gypsum board.

As to claim 33, Lehnert teaches Portland cement and poly(vinyl acetate), poly(vinyl chloride) and acrylic resins for use in the gypsum core that are effective additives to improve water resistance (col.10, lines 6-25). Portland cement is a hydraulic set material and meets the limitations of claim 33. Lehnert further teaches hydraulic set materials and teaches panels with cement based cores of hydraulic cement or Portland cements (col. 2, lines 38-57).

2. **Claims 18-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehnert (US 4,647,496) in view of Graves (US 5,389,716) and Gill (US 4,637,951) and in further view of Kajander et al. (US 2003/00332350).** The previous Office Action rejection of 11/27/2007 is maintained.

Lehnert teaches a fibrous mat-faced gypsum board comprised of a gypsum core that is sandwiched between two sheets of glass mat (ABST). As to claim 18, Lehnert teaches a resinous binder of "modified urea –formaldehyde" (col. 14, lines 35-37). As to claim 19, Lehnert differs from the current application and does not teach a modified

acrylic latex binder (claim 19). Lehnert differs from the current application and does not teach a resinous binder comprising a melamine formaldehyde cross-linker (claim 22) with a glass transition temperature between 15-45°C (claim 23) at a composition percentage of up to 10% and between 2-5% (claims 20 and 21).

Graves teaches a fire resistant bonder for fibrous mats where the mats are comprised of glass fibers or mineral fibers (col. 2, lines 34-36). Graves teaches typical binder systems for glass fibers include urea-formaldehyde, phenolic resins, bone glue, polyvinyl alcohols, acrylic resins and polyvinyl acetates. Graves teaches a binder composition comprising a stable mixture of a fire resistant latex preferably a halogenated latex polymer more preferably also carboxylated; an aqueous aldehyde condensation polymer-based thermosetting resin, preferably an urea-aldehyde thermosetting resin (col. 2, lines 35-40). A thermosetting resin is a crosslinking resin.

Kajander teaches foam coated nonwoven fibrous mat particularly suited for a facer on gypsum wallboards (ABST). Kajander teaches a mat primarily of glass fibers with a minor portion of resinous binder (ABST). As to claim 23, Kajander teaches conventional resinous binders of modified urea formaldehyde as well as a melamine formaldehyde, a latex containing mixture of cross linked vinyl chloride acrylate copolymer having a glass transition temperature as high as about 113°F (45°C) and preferably about 97°F (36°C) and a small amount of stearylated melamine [0012]. As to claims 20 and 21, Kajander teaches about 5% cross-linking agent [0045].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a thermosetting, crosslinking binder in the fibrous glass

mat of Lehnert motivated to improve the properties of the bond mat and gypsum board. It further would have been obvious to employ a binder with a relatively high glass transition temperature of Kajander motivated to improve the heat resistance of the gypsum board. It would have been obvious to employ a crosslinking agent of the amount of 2 to 5 to 10% motivated to optimize the glass transition temperature of the binder.

3. **Claims 16 and 25-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehnert (US 4,647,496) in view of Graves (US 5,389,716) and Gill (US 4,637,951) in further view of Carbo (US 2004/0209071).** The previous Office Action rejection of 11/27/2007 is maintained.

Lehnert teaches a fibrous mat-faced gypsum board comprised of a gypsum core that is sandwiched between two sheets of glass mat (ABST). Lehnert teaches gypsum sheathing and gypsum core of wallboard and building materials where the gypsum has many desirable characteristics such as fire-resistant properties and water resistance. Lehnert teaches conventional gypsum wallboard that is covered with paper sheets and Lehnert teaches the disadvantages of water seepage through paper. Lehnert teaches that paper facers were known in the art in the art at the time the invention was made. Paper facers are considered inclusive of Kraft paper. Lehnert differs from the current application and does not teach reinforcing fiber and does not teach a biocide in the gypsum core.

Carbo teaches a mold resistant acoustical panel, ceiling tile and wall materials. Carbo teaches gypsum is a preferred material in the panel because if provides surface hardness and fire resistance [0021]. Carbo teaches fillers including reinforcing fibers that are cellulosic and fibers of mineral wool [0023]. Carbo teaches an antimicrobial agent or biocide such as zinc pyrthione can be added to the gypsum panel core [0027] and [0029].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ reinforcing fibers and a biocide in the gypsum core of the building material of Lehnert motivated to produce a building material that is resistant to mold and stronger. It further would have been obvious to employ a gypsum core that is fire resistant as taught by Carbo. When the reference discloses all the limitations of a claim except a property or function, and the examiner cannot determine whether or not the reference inherently possesses properties which anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention the examiner has basis for shifting the burden of proof to applicant as in In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § § 2112-2112.02.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant noted that the Office Action Summary of 5/28/2008 did not include claims 32 and 33. These claims were included in the rejection and the omission on the Office Action was an error. The Office Action Summary includes these claims.

5. Applicant stated that claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 11-29 and 31-33 are pending in the Application however it is claims 1-3, 5,7, 9,11-23, 25-29 and 31-33 that are pending. Correction has been made to Office Action Summary and to Office Action to clarify the rejection.

6. Applicant stated that claims 1-3, 5,7, 9,11-23, 25-29 and 31-33 are pending in the Application and these claims were rejected in the previous Office Action of 5/28/2008. New Claim 34 was added to the claim amendments submitted after a Notice of Appeal. These claims were not entered at the time of response to the Appeal Brief wherein prosecution was re-opened. Claim 34 was rejected in the previous Non-Final Action of 11/15/2007 and the NonFinal Action of 5/28/2008. Claim 34 is included in the Office Action Summary and the opening rejection paragraph to clarify the status of the claim.

7. Applicant's arguments filed 8/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the current invention produces a mat with a high permeability, a smoother surface than boards produced employing fibers having either a larger or smaller average diameter. Applicant states that the gypsum board exhibits a combination of desirable structural and functional features that render it fire resistant and easily painted.

- Applicant argues that the combination of Lehnert and Gill is improper and results in hindsight reconstruction because Lehnert is drawn to a glass fiber mat wherein gypsum penetrates part-way into the thickness of the

glass mat and Gill is drawn to a glass fiber mat that resists strikethrough of curable materials.

- Applicants argue that the fibrous mats are used for entirely different purposes.
- Applicant argues that avoidance of strikethrough is an objective diametrically opposed to the level of porosity needed for gypsum board fabrication.

Examiner has relied upon Gill for teaching that the porosity and permeability of a glass fiber mat can be controlled by the fiber sizes and distribution of fibers sizes. Gill teaches the fibers sizes as claimed in the current application. Plus Gill teaches that the selection of the fiber sizes can optimize the properties of porosity and permeability in a glass fiber mat. Examiner agrees that Gill does not teach an application for use as a gypsum board, however Graves teaches glass fiber mats for use in gypsum boards and references Gill's teaching on the selection of fiber sizes and that the mat of Gill is known to be more porous (col. 11, lines 11-33). Lehnert, Graves and Gill present findings that one of ordinary skill in the could produce a glass fiber mat with the desired porosity and permeability with a reasonable expectation of success in producing a gypsum board with the desired structural strength and surface smoothness and permeability.

8. As to Applicant's arguments that Gill teaches a mat that is "resistant to strikethrough and this is diametrically opposed to the level of porosity needed for a gypsum board", Examiner asserts that there are other structural components added to

the glass mat of Gill which inhibits the strikethrough of curable materials. In other words, the properties of strikethrough, permeability and porosity can not be equated. Gill utilizes binder components in the glass fiber mat such as wet proofing additives and a heat settable polymer that are selected from a group consisting of water based silicone elastomer and fluorochemical emulsions. As Gill and Graves both teach that fiber sizes can be optimized to produce the permeability and porosity of the glass fiber mat, one of ordinary skill in the art could employ the teaches of Gill and Graves to produce a glass fiber mat with the desired level of porosity and permeability required to produce a strong, yet smooth glass fiber mat for a gypsum board application. The fact that Gill has also incorporated an additional feature of a water proof binder system in the glass fiber mat does not exclude the teachings of Gill that provide a basis that fiber sizes can be optimized to affect the porosity and permeability of the glass fiber mat. "The use of patents as references is not limited to what the patentees describe as their own inventions or to the problems with which they are concerned. They are part of the literature of the art, relevant for all they contain." In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

With respect to Applicant's arguments that there is no suggestion of motivation to combine, the rationale to modify or combine the prior art does not have to be expressly stated in the prior art; the rationale may be expressly or impliedly contained in the prior art or it may be reasoned from knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, established scientific principles, or legal precedent established by prior case

law. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347,21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

9. Applicant's arguments are not commensurate with the scope of the claims. Applicant does not claim that the gypsum is required to penetrate through the glass fiber mat and this structural limitation is required to achieve the desired property of the invention. Applicant does not claim that the fiber sizes as claimed produce a porosity that allows penetration of the gypsum. Applicant's claim the air permeability of the glass fiber mat. The property of air permeability is not equated with porosity that allows penetration of gypsum slurry into the glass fiber mat. It is understood that the properties of porosity, strikethrough and permeability are argued to show that there is no motivation to combine the references and that the references teach away from each other. As Lehnert, Graves and Gill teach glass fiber mats, it would have been obvious to look to the teachings of Lehnert, Graves and Gill in order to produce a glass mat for a gypsum board. Lehnert, Graves and Gill presents findings that one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the features of the glass fiber mats in a gypsum board with a reasonable expectation of success in producing the desired gypsum board structure and properties.

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claims 18-23 as being unpatentable over Lehnert in view of Graves and Gill and in further view of Kajander are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Kajander is not seen to remedy the

deficiencies of Lehnert in view of Graves and Gill. As the rejection of independent claims over Lehnert in view of Graves and Gill is maintained the rejection with respect to Lehnert in view of Graves, Gill and Kajander is also maintained.

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claims 16 and 25-28 as being unpatentable over Lehnert in view of Graves and Gill and in further view of Carbo are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Carbo is not seen to remedy the deficiencies of Lehnert in view of Graves and Gill. As the rejection of independent claims over Lehnert in view of Graves and Gill is maintained the rejection with respect to Lehnert in view of Graves, Gill and Carbo is also maintained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENNIFER STEELE whose telephone number is (571)272-7115. The examiner can normally be reached on Office Hours Mon-Fri 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Tarazano can be reached on (571) 272-1515. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. S./
Jennifer Steele
Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/Elizabeth M. Cole/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

12/6/2008